
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 7 October 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/N5660/W/25/3362202

25 Montford Place, London SE11 5DE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Juliet Ferguson-Rose against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 24/03508/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey ground floor rear and rear infill extension, with internal alterations to the ground and first floor.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/N5660/Y/25/3362368

25 Montford Place, London SE11 5DE

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Juliet Ferguson-Rose against the decision of Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 24/03509/LB.
 - The works proposed are the erection of a single storey ground floor rear and rear infill extension, with internal alterations to the ground and first floor.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A: The appeal is dismissed
2. Appeal B: The appeal is dismissed

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal site forms part of the Grade II listed building known as '2 and 7-25, Montford Place', which, as an entity, is comprised of a terrace in the Kennington Conservation Area (CA). In reaching my decisions, I have considered the statutory duties under sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (the Act).
4. The appeals concern the same site and the same scheme. Although the remit of planning permission (Appeal A) and listed building consent (Appeal B) regimes are different, to reduce repetition, I have dealt with both appeals together in a single decision letter.

Main Issues

5. The main issue in both appeals is whether the proposal would preserve the listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, in addition to whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the

character or appearance of the Kennington Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The appeals site consists of one of a lengthy terrace, which includes Nos 3 and 7-25 Montford Place¹, a grade II listed building from approximately 1780, which was added to the statutory list in 1990. It is made up of three storey Flemish brick bond dwellings, with stone parapets, slate roofs and brick chimneys. The properties have two sash windows on each floor, with an arched design on the ground floor.
6. Based on the evidence before me, I find that the special interest and significance of the listed building to be primarily associated with its historic and architectural interests as a good illustration of Georgian domestic architecture. Important contributors in these regards which are pertinent to the appeals are its architectural detailing, consistency, group value, and extant historic fabric.
7. No 25 retains these external architectural qualities. The rear of the terrace does not contribute to its special interest to the same extent as the decorative frontage. This is a conscious design factor in status differentiation reflected in the building's front and rear elevations. Whilst neither the rear nor interior is included in the list description, this does not indicate a lack of special interest or significance.
8. Nos 23 and 25 have a paired two storey rear projection. Whilst this is clearly a later addition and is of negligible historic interest, the rear of No 25 appears as a traditional elevation in terms of its standard form and solid to void ratio, and excluding the ground floor double doors, historically appropriate traditional timber fenestration. The rest of the terrace has a variety of single storey additions and infills, including, as indicated in the submitted design and access statement², recently permitted extensions at Nos 5³ and 17⁴. Whilst No 5 is not part of the listed building, the rear of the terrace is evidently not as consistent as the frontage therefore and the additions and extensions are largely not sensitive to the building's historic aesthetics. The character and form of the listed building has therefore been compromised.
9. Nevertheless, even with the addition of a two storey rear projection, No 25 retains a legible historic form, as internally it has a standard floor plan with two rooms front and rear accessed off of a side hall and rear stairwell which leads into the rear projection. This historic plan-form remains legible and the phases of the property and its extension, clear. As such, the internal layout adds to the special interest of the listed building, as it contributes to the understanding of the original houses' design.
10. As a fundamental component, No 25 makes a valuable contribution to the architectural consistency of the rest of the listed terrace and is integral to the special architectural and historic interest, and group value, of Nos 3 and 7-25 as an entity.
11. The character and appearance and therefore the special interest and significance of the Kennington CA are mainly derived from its surviving consistent high quality 18th century terraced housing, which form a coherent whole while reflecting

¹ List Entry Number: 1263532

² By CAN November 2024

³ Application reference 21/03999/FUL

⁴ Application reference 16/04946/FUL

different phases of development. As an integral part of a coherent 18th century residential townscape, Nos 3 and 7-25 Montford Place contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.

12. The proposal seeks to add a side/rear extension which would infill the gap between the existing rear projection and No 27 with a pitched glass roof and extend 1.2 metres from the back of the existing property. It would also have a trellis canopy feature and double glazed doors to the garden. Internally, walls on the ground floor would be removed to create an open plan kitchen, living, and dining space. A new ground floor WC would be introduced underneath the existing staircase.
13. The staircase on the first floor would be altered to provide better access to the existing extension on the first floor. The layout of the existing bathroom would be altered to provide an en-suite bathroom for the primary bedroom. Finally, the plans state that the front door would be replaced with a new door to match No 23 and painted dark green, and the existing white timber windows would be 'refurbished' and painted green.
14. The alterations to the floorplan on the first floor or ground floor WC would not obscure the retained historic traditional layout. However, the proposed extension would result in a large open rear living area, with large expanses of glazing. Whilst as stated above, there is at present double doors, there remains a mostly solid rear elevation.
15. There would be a clear distinction between what is new and what is not, however the almost entirely glazed rear elevation would compromise its existing traditional character and would appear as a conspicuously modern addition. The proposed painted metal trellis canopy addition would not obscure nor lessen the visual dominance of the fenestration and its harmful effect in compromising the existing solid to void ratio.
16. This would also require the removal of the existing main rear wall, notwithstanding the later rear projection⁵, and would therefore result in a loss of historic fabric. Whilst nibs on each side and indications on the floor and surfaces would indicate where the existing wall/opening would have been located, the scale of the rear room, which would be larger than any of the existing rooms, would also disrupt the hierarchy of the primary historic core and secondary extension.
17. Little detail is submitted regarding what the replacement door would consist of and what the refurbishment of the windows, as indicated on the submitted front elevation plan, would entail. Moreover, the proposed rear elevation plan indicates that a small rear facing second floor window would be 'replaced to match existing'. No detail of the existing window and its condition or justification for its replacement is provided.
18. In order to avoid any uncertainty over what is proposed, and to allow a robust assessment of any consequent effects these details should be provided. Given the ambiguity, I cannot be certain that these elements of the scheme would preserve the listed building's special interest and not harm its significance. Given the importance of these details and the listed status of the building, I am not satisfied

⁵ The date of which is unclear, with the appeal statement putting it as mid 20th century.

that it would be appropriate or acceptable to leave such important matters to be dealt with by conditions.

19. The appellant points to a similar development at No 7⁶. Limited details are provided of this development including the circumstances and policy context of the planning decision, which prevents direct comparison. However, the rear of the approved extension does not appear to be completely glazed to the extent that is proposed, and, as is the case with the projections to Nos 5, 7, 9 and 11 that may extend further into the garden area, in any case, this is not a sufficient justification for the further weakening of the architectural and historic interest of the listed building.
20. I conclude that the proposed works and development would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, Nos 3 and 7-25 Montford Place, and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
21. The above harm to significance would result in some residual harmful effect to the character and appearance of the CA. It would not therefore preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
22. Given the varied existing rear extensions to the listed building including those identified above, I find the harm to both heritage assets to be, individually and cumulatively, at a minor level of 'less than substantial' but nevertheless is of considerable importance and weight.
23. There would be some economic benefits brought about through the investment into the property and the construction phase. Also, social benefits would be gained through improvements to the local housing stock, including the level of light reaching the rear rooms of the appeal property. There would also be some benefit in terms of ecology from the 'meadow roof' to the additional rear projection and the canopy would provide some solar shading for the south/east-facing rear of the house. Given the scale of the works, these benefits would each be small. There is no substantive evidence before me that the works are required to secure the optimum viable use of the listed building.
24. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that, when considering the impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of whether any harm amounts to less than substantial harm to significance. Overall, the weight I ascribe to the public benefits which would accrue from the proposal, is not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight I attach to the harm to significance I have found.
25. Consequently, the harm identified to the significance of the designated heritage assets has not been supported by clear and convincing justification. The works and development therefore would conflict with the statutory presumptions set out in sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act and fail to satisfy the historic environment conservation and enhancement policies of the Framework. There is also conflict with Policies Q5, Q11, Q20 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (2021) insofar as these require high quality design that positively responds to

⁶ Application reference 12/00360/FUL

the original architecture and protects, conserves and where possible enhances the historic environment.

Conclusion

26. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR